#### \_

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: BUCKINGHAM EXCEP. STUDENT CENTER

District Name: Lee

Principal: William R. Elkin

SAC Chair: April Watson

Superintendent: Dr. Joseph P. Burke

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 9/20/2012



Gerard Robinson, Commissioner Florida Department of Education 325 West Gaines Street Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Dr. Mike Grego, Chancellor K-12 Public Schools Florida Department of Education 325 West Gaines Street Tallahassee, Florida 32399

### PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

#### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

Note: The following links will open in a separate browser window.

School Grades Trend Data

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

#### **ADMINISTRATORS**

List your school's administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and Ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	William R. Elkin	B.S. Degree in Mental Retardation and Master's Degree in Administration and Supervision. Certification in Mental Retardation, Varying Exceptionalities, Specific Learning Disabilities and Administration/Supervision	11	26	The school did not meet AYP for the 2009- 10 school year. AYP was met for the 2004- 2005 school year.
Principal	William R. Elkin	B.S. Degree in Mental Retardation and Master's Degree in Administration and Supervision. Certification in Mental Retardation, Varying	12	27	The school did not meet AYP for the 2010- 11 school year. AYP was met for the 2004- 05 school year.

		Exceptionalities, Specific Learning Disabilities and Administration/Supervision			
Principal	William R. Elkin	B.S. Degree in Mental Retardation and Master's Degree in Administration and Supervision. Certification in Mental Retardation, Varying Exceptionalities, Specfic Learning Disabilities and Administration/Supervision	13	28	34% of the students made Reading gains on the Florida Alternate Assessment in 2011-12 compared to 11% for 2010-11, resulting in an "Improving Rating". 30% of the students made Math gains on the Florida Alternate Assessment in 2011-12 compared to 23% for 2010-11, resulting in an "Improving Rating". The Preliminary Improvement Rating for 2011-12 was "Improving".

#### **INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES**

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (Percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
N/A	N/A	NA			N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A

#### EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, effective teachers to the school.

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
	Regular meetings of new teachers with the Principal Partnering new teachers to the school with veteran staff	Principal	May 24, 2013	
2	Involve teachers in Professional Learning Communities to become familiar with the Access Points and the Access Courses	Principal	May 24, 2013	
3	TEACH Training - Behavior Management Techniques	Behavior Specialist	January 2013	

#### Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

\*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out- of-field/ and who are not highly	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
effective.  1. Teachers Out of Field = 0 2. Teachers NOT effective/highly effective based on the 2012 manager's evaluation = 0 3. Paraprofessionals NOT highly qualified = 0	Teachers are reviewing the Access Points/Access Courses and the CCSS in PLCs as part of a school-wide inservice activity.

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.

\*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
14	0.0%(0)	21.4%(3)	50.0%(7)	28.6%(4)	57.1%(8)	100.0%(14)	0.0%(0)	7.1%(1)	14.3%(2)

#### Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Barbara Curtis	Samantha Youd	Samantha is new to the school and teaching the Math Theme. Barb has taught the Math Theme since she began at the school and is very familiar with Samantha's students.	The teachers will meet as needed throughout the school year.
Rita Ellis	William Roche	William is new to the school and teaching the Shadehouse Theme. Rita is very familiar with William's students.	The teachers will meet as needed throughout the school year

### ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

#### Coordination and Integration

#### Note: For Title I schools only

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

I, Part A
I, Part C- Migrant
I, Part D
II

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
/iolence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
pareer and recrimed Education
Job Training
Other.
Other Control of the
Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)/Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI) -School-based MTSS/RtI Team Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.
Since all of the students at Buckingham Exceptional Student Center have been identified with a disability(ies) and have Individualized Education Plans, there is no need for a school-based MTSS Team.
Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?
with other school teams to organize/coordinate wirss enorts:
Not Applicable
Not Applicable  Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement
Not Applicable  Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?
Not Applicable  Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?  Not Applicable
Not Applicable  Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?
Not Applicable  Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?  Not Applicable  MTSS Implementation  Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics,
Not Applicable  Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?  Not Applicable  -MTSS I mplementation  Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.
Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)
-School-Based Literacy Leadership Team-
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).
Six classroom teachers make up the Schedule A Instructional Theme Group. The students in these six classrooms are part of a four-day (M-Th)block schedule that provides opportunities to change classes and receive specific course instruction.
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).
Each teacher is assigned a specific instructional theme. The content of the teacher's theme is based on the students' Individualized Education Plan (IEP) goals that the teacher is assigned and the Access Points/Access Courses that are used for the instructional theme.
The six teachers will meet on a monthly basis to discuss their students progress and share instructional/behavioral strategies. They will also meet 30 minutes every Tuesday to discuss their progress with the Access Points/Access Courses.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?
Each teacher will collect data on the IEP goals for their theme.  This data will be used to develop or modify the IEP goals at the student's next IEP meeting.  IEP goal mastery will be determined for each theme at the end of the school year.  The group will become familiar with the Access Points in Math, Science, Reading/Language Arts and Physical Education. Access Courses in these instructional areas will be incorporated into the Quarterly Course Outlines and the Weekly Lesson Plans.
Public School Choice
Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification No Attachment
*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition
Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.
*Grades 6-12 Only
Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.
For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher.
*High Schools Only
Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.
How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

Each student has an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) that is updated annually. The IEP team develops annual goals based on the needs and strengths of the individual student. Support Coordinators are encouraged to attend the IEP meetings for students age 16 and above. All students in the 6 classrooms that are in Schedule A will participate in the Vocational Theme and the Shadehouse Theme two periods per week.

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the <u>High School Feedback Report</u>

#### PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

#### Reading Goals

\* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)). Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Responsible **Evaluation Tool** Strategy Effectiveness of Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: In 2011-12 4% of the students performed at Levels 4,5 and 6 in Reading based on the Florida Alternate Assessment. For Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. the 2012-13 school year 8% of the students in grades 3-10 will perform at Levels 4,5 and 6 in Reading as measured by Reading Goal #1b: the Florida Alternate Assessment. 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 4% (2 students) performed at Levels 4, 5 and 6 in Reading 8% will perform at Levels 4, 5 and 6 in Reading based on the based on the Florida Alternate Assessment. Florida Alternate Assessment. Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Process Used to Person or Position Determine **Anticipated Barrier** Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Effectiveness of Responsible for Monitoring Strategy The cognitive functioning Teachers will use the Principal Classroom Walkthroughs Florida Alternate levels for all of the UniqueLearningSystem and periodic review of Assessment and students and the instructional tool and student performance on the results of the physical disabilities for the Reading Access Classroom include the appropriate approximately one-half of grade level(s) Reading Points Walkthroughs the student population Access Points in their impact the performance weekly lesson plans. on the Florida Alternate Assessment.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Student Level 4 in reading.	s scoring at or abov	ve Achievement					
Reading Goal #2a:							
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solvi	ing Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement			
Anticipated Barrier Strategy		Posit Resp for	on or tion consible		Evaluation Tool		
		No Data	Submitted				
Based on the analysis o of improvement for the		it data, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", iden	tify and define areas in nee		
2b. Florida Alternate A Students scoring at or reading.		nt Level 7 in					
Reading Goal #2b:							
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perform	mance:		
	Problem-Solvi	ing Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement			
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posi Resp for		Posit Resp for	on or tion consible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Submitted		,		
Based on the analysis o of improvement for the		nt data, and refer	ence to "G	Guiding Questions", iden	tify and define areas in nee		
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentagains in reading.	age of students mak	king learning					
Reading Goal #3a:							
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
	Problem-Solvi	ing Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement			

Anti	nticipated Barrier Strategy		ду	Posit Resp for	on or ion onsible toring	Det Effe	cess Used to ermine ectiveness of ategy	Evaluation Tool	
			No	Data	Submitted				
	d on the analysis of suprovement for the fo		achievement data, and group:	refer	ence to "Gu	ıiding	Questions", identify	and o	define areas in nee
Perce read	Florida Alternate As entage of students ing. ding Goal #3b:				Reading. For in grades 3	or th	6 of our students made 2012-13 school yea D will make learning ga De Florida Alternate A	ır, 39 ains i	% of the students n Reading based or
2012	2 Current Level of P	erforma	ance:		2013 Expe	ecte	d Level of Performar	nce:	
11 ar			ng gains in Reading in 20 n 2011-12. This is a 23				students making learr at least 39%, a 5% i		
		Pro	blem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease St	uder	nt Achievement		
	Anticipated Bar	rier	Strategy	R	Person or Position esponsible Monitorin	for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness o Strategy		Evaluation Too
1	levels for all of the students and the physical disabilities	for in half of control of the half of control of the half of control of the half of the ha	Teachers will use the UniqueLearningSystem Instructional tool and Include the appropriate grade level(s) Reading Access Points in their weekly lesson plans.  The teachers will meet 80 minutes per week (PLCs) to discuss their progress with the Integration of the Acces Points within their week esson plans.	35	ncipal		Classroom Walkthrou and periodic review of student performance the Reading Access Points.	of	Florida Alternate Assessment and the results of the Classroom Walkthroughs
	d on the analysis of suprovement for the fo		achievement data, and group:	refer	ence to "Gu	ıiding	g Questions", identify	and o	define areas in nec
maki	CAT 2.0: Percentage ing learning gains in ding Goal #4:		dents in Lowest 25% ng.						
	2 Current Level of P	erform:	ance.		2013 Expe	ecte	d Level of Performar	nce.	
	2 2 3	2					2010. 011 0110111101		
		Pro	blem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease St	uder	nt Achievement		
Anti	cipated Barrier	Strate	ду	Posit Resp for	on or ion onsible toring	Det Effe	cess Used to ermine ectiveness of ategy	Eval	uation Tool

Based on Ambi	itious but Ad	chievable Annual	Maagurahla	Ohiectiv		\	Dooding and Ma		
		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	weasurable	Objectiv	ves (AMOs)	), AIVIO-2, I	Reading and Ma	ith Perfo	ormance Target
ΓΛ Λ la iti a	la vet. A a la la vea	la la Americal	Reading Goa	al#					
	jectives (AN	MOs). In six year							4
school will reduby 50%.	uce their ac	nievement gap							
by 3070.			5A :						
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2 2012-2013	2013-2014		2014	l-2015	2015-2016	5	2016-2017
								$\neg \mid$	
	,	,	'		,		,		
		tudent achievemo		d refere	ence to "Gu	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and def	fine areas in nee
5B. Student s	ubgroups k	by ethnicity (Wh	nite, Black,						
	an, America	an Indian) not m							
Reading Goal	#5B:								
2012 Current	Level of Pe	erformance:			2013 Expe	ected Leve	el of Performa	nce:	
		Problem-Sol	lving Proces	ss to In	ncrease St	udent Ach	nievement		
				Perso Positi		Process L	Jsed to		
A 4.1 - 1 41	Anticipated Barrier Strategy				OH	Determine Effectiveness of		Evaluation Tool	
Anticipated E	sarrier	Strategy			onsible			Evalua	ation Tool
Anticipated E	sarrier	Strategy		for				Evalua	ation Tool
Anticipated E	sarrer	Strategy	No	for Monit	oring	Effective		Evalua	ation Tool
Anticipated E	баттег	Strategy	No	for Monit		Effective		Evalua	ation Tool
Anticipated E	oarriei	Strategy	No	for Monit	oring	Effective		Evalua	ation Tool
				for Monito Data S	oring	Effective Strategy	ness of		
Based on the a	analysis of s	tudent achievemolowing subgroup:	ent data, and	for Monito Data S	oring	Effective Strategy	ness of		
Based on the a of improvemen 5C. English La	analysis of s ant for the fol anguage Le	tudent achievem lowing subgroup: arners (ELL) no	ent data, and	for Monito Data S	oring	Effective Strategy	ness of		
Based on the a	analysis of s ant for the fol anguage Le	tudent achievem lowing subgroup: arners (ELL) no	ent data, and	for Monito Data S	oring	Effective Strategy	ness of		
Based on the a of improvemen 5C. English La	analysis of s ant for the fol anguage Le progress in	tudent achievem lowing subgroup: arners (ELL) no	ent data, and	for Monito Data S	oring	Effective Strategy	ness of		
Based on the a of improvemen 5C. English La satisfactory p	analysis of s ant for the fol anguage Le progress in #5C:	tudent achievemo owing subgroup: arners (ELL) no reading.	ent data, and	for Moniton Data S	oring submitted ence to "Gu	Effective Strategy	ness of	and def	
Based on the a of improvements 5C. English Lastisfactory processing the seading Goal	analysis of s ant for the fol anguage Le progress in #5C:	tudent achievemo owing subgroup: arners (ELL) no reading.	ent data, and	for Moniton Data S	oring submitted ence to "Gu	Effective Strategy	ness of	and def	
Based on the a of improvements 5C. English Lastisfactory processing the seading Goal	analysis of s ant for the fol anguage Le progress in #5C:	tudent achievemo owing subgroup: arners (ELL) no reading.	ent data, and	for Moniton Data S	oring submitted ence to "Gu	Effective Strategy	ness of	and def	
Based on the a of improvements 5C. English Lastisfactory processing the seading Goal	analysis of s ant for the fol anguage Le progress in #5C:	tudent achievemo owing subgroup: arners (ELL) no reading.	ent data, and	for Moniton Data S	oring submitted ence to "Gu	Effective Strategy	ness of	and def	
Based on the a of improvements 5C. English Lastisfactory processing the seading Goal	analysis of s ant for the fol anguage Le progress in #5C:	tudent achievemo owing subgroup: arners (ELL) no reading.	ent data, and	for Monito	oring submitted ence to "Gu	Effective Strategy	ness of	and def	
Based on the a of improvements 5C. English Lastisfactory processing the seading Goal	analysis of s ant for the fol anguage Le progress in #5C:	tudent achieveme lowing subgroup: arners (ELL) no reading. erformance:	ent data, and	for Monitor Data Solution of the Monitor Monitor of the Monitor of	oring submitted ence to "Gu	Effective Strategy uiding Ques	ness of ditions", identify	and def	
Based on the a of improvements. English Lastisfactory properties and the control of the control	analysis of soft for the follonguage Leorogress in #5C:	tudent achievemi lowing subgroup: arners (ELL) no reading. erformance:	ent data, and	for Monitor Data Solution of Data Soluti	oring submitted ence to "Gu	Effective Strategy	ness of stions", identify el of Performa	and def	fine areas in nee
Based on the a of improvements 5C. English Lastisfactory processing the seading Goal	analysis of soft for the follonguage Leorogress in #5C:	tudent achieveme lowing subgroup: arners (ELL) no reading. erformance:	ent data, and	for Monitor Data Solution of Data Soluti	oring submitted ence to "Gu	Effectives Strategy	ness of stions", identify el of Performal vievement	and def	

	on the analysis of stu provement for the follo		t achievement data, and i subgroup:	refer	ence to "Guid	ding	Questions", identify a	ınd c	define areas in nee
satisf	5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5D:				During the 2010-11 school year 57 students were assessed in Reading proficiency with the Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA). 5 (8.8%) students scored at the Achieved Level, and 52 (91.2%) scored at the Emerging Level. This similar profile accurred during the 2007-08, 2008-09 and 2009-10 school years as well. The school must continue writing IEP goals for the students in the area of Reading.				
2012	2012 Current Level of Performance:				2013 Expec	ted	Level of Performan	ce:	
During the 2010-11 school year 35 out of 45 (77.8%) of the IEP goals for reading were mastered by students in grades 3-10. The IEP goal percentage for all students was 66 out of 81 (81.5%) for the school year.				s 3-	reading profi for all studer	icier nts i I by	et for percentage of s ncy is benchmarked at in grades 3-10 for the the percentage of IEI ding.	eigl 201	hty percent (80%) 1-12 school year,
		Pro	oblem-Solving Process	to I	ncrease Stud	den	t Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier Strategy			R	Person or Position esponsible fo Monitoring	or	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		Evaluation Tool
1	School attendance du to illnesses/therapy/doc visit may impact the progress on the IEP g Many of the students have physical/visual/audito disabilities that impac performance on the F	goal. s bry ct	Each classroom teacher will use an interactive whiteboard as part of the instructional day. Teachers will incorporate Reading Access Points in their Course Outlines and daily lesson plans. Teachers will have access to the district adopted curriculum (uniquelearningsystems) that also addresses the Access Points.	e	ncipal		Review Course Outlin and weekly lesson pla conduct Classroom Walkthroughs		Data collection on the percentage of IEP goals mastered in Reading. Results of the Florida Alternate Assessment in Reading.
	on the analysis of stu		t achievement data, and i subgroup:	refer	ence to "Guid	ling	Questions", identify a	ınd c	define areas in nee
1	conomically Disadva actory progress in re	_	ged students not makin ng.	g					
Readi	ng Goal #5E:								
2012	Current Level of Per	rform	nance:		2013 Expec	ted	Level of Performan	ce:	
		Pro	oblem-Solving Process	to I	ncrease Stud	den	t Achievement		
Antic	ipated Barrier S	Strate	egy F	Posit Resp for	onsible E	ete Iffe	ess Used to ermine ctiveness of tegy	Eval	uation Tool
			No E	)ata :	Submitted				
[									

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible fo Monitoring
Reading Access Points and Access Courses	K-12 Reading	Principal	Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)	30 minutes per week	Classroom Walkthroughs and Lesson Plan Reviews	Principal

#### Reading Budget:

			Available
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Access Points/Access Courses	Teacher Computers and Computer Based Instructional Tools/Resources	NA	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Electronic Lesson Plan Template Interactive Whiteboards	Teacher Computers and CPALMS UniqueLearningSystems	NA	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
PLCs meet weekly Lesson Study School Based Workshop	CPALMS Lesson Study and substitutes Classroom Suite, Intellikeys/Overlay Maker	Title II	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$500.00

End of Reading Goa

# Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

Students speak in English and understand spoken English a	at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.
Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.  CELLA Goal #1:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening	ng/speaking:

	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to Increase S	Student Achievement						
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool					
No Data Submitted									
Students read in English	n at grade level text in a mar	nner similar to no	on-ELL students.						
2. Students scoring pr	oficient in reading.								
CELLA Goal #2:									
2012 Current Percent	of Students Proficient in re	eading:							
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to Increase \$							
	T		1	1					
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool					
	Nc	Data Submitted							
Students write in English	h at grade level in a manner	similar to non-E	LL students.						
3. Students scoring pr	oficient in writing.								
CELLA Goal #3:									
2012 Current Percent	of Students Proficient in w	vriting:							
	Problem-Solving Proces	ss to Increase S	Student Achievement						
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool					
	Nc	Data Submitted							

Evidence-based Progra	am(s)/Material(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developm	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		-	Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of CELLA Goals

# **Elementary School Mathematics Goals**

	9								
* Whei	n using percentages, ir	nclude	the number of students the	e perc	entage repre	sents	(e.g., 70% (35)).		
	on the analysis of s provement for the foll		t achievement data, and group:	refer	ence to "Gu	uiding	Questions", identify	and d	define areas in ne
	CAT2.0: Students seematics.	coring	g at Achievement Leve	I 3 in	1				
Math	ematics Goal #1a:								
2012 Current Level of Performance:					2013 Expe	ected	d Level of Performan	nce:	
		Pr	oblem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease St	uder	nt Achievement		
Antic	Anticipated Barrier Strategy Res for				on or ion onsible toring	Dete Effe	rocess Used to letermine ffectiveness of trategy  Evaluation Tool		
			No	Data	Submitted				
	on the analysis of s provement for the foll		t achievement data, and group:	refer	ence to "Gu	uiding	Questions", identify	and c	define areas in ne
Stude	lorida Alternate Assents scoring at Leve ematics Goal #1b:		nent: 5, and 6 in mathemati	CS.	6 in Math of 13 school y perform at	on th year, Leve	of our students perfo e Florida Alternate As 8% of our students i els 4, 5 and 6 in Math e Asssessment.	sessr n gra	ment. For the 201 des 3-10 will
2012	Current Level of Pe	erforn	nance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
	3 students) performe e Florida Alternate As		evels 4,5 and 6 in Math nent.	based			ents will perform at Le orida Alternate Asses		
		Pr	oblem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease St	uder	nt Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier Strategy		R	Person o Position esponsible Monitorin	for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		Evaluation Too	
1	The cognitive functi levels for all of the students and the physical disabilities approximately one-h the student populat impact the performa on the Florida Alterr	for nalf of ion ance	Teachers will use the UniqueLearningSystem instructional tool and include the appropriate grade level(s) Math Access Points in their weekly lesson plans.	Pri	ncipal		Classroom Walkthrou and periodic review of student performance the Math Access Poi	of e on	Florida Alternate Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.

Assessment.

Mathematics Goal #2a:							
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perfor	mance:		
	Problem-Solving	g Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement			
Anticipated Barrier	ticipated Barrier Strategy		on or tion ponsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
		No Data	Submitted				
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the for		data, and refer	rence to "G	uiding Questions", iden	tify and define areas in nee		
2b. Florida Alternate A Students scoring at or mathematics.		Level 7 in					
Mathematics Goal #2b:							
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perfor	mance:		
	Problem-Solvino	g Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement			
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
		No Data	Submitted	-	·		
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo		data, and refer	rence to "Gi	uiding Questions", iden	tify and define areas in nee		
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentagains in mathematics.	ge of students makir	ng learning					
Mathematics Goal #3a:							
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
	Problem-Solvino	g Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement			

Antic	Anticipated Barrier Strategy		egy	Posi Res for	son or ition ponsible nitoring	Dete Effe	cess Used to ermine ctiveness of itegy	Eval	uation Tool	
			No	Data	Submitted					
	on the analysis of sprovement for the fol		t achievement data, and group:	l refe	erence to "Gu	iiding	Questions", identify	and o	define areas in need	
	orida Alternate As									
Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.					For the 20° grades 3-1	12-13 0 wil	6 of our students mad 3 school year, 36.5% I make learning gains Iorida Alternate Asses	of ou	ur students in ath based on the	
Mathe	ematics Goal #3b:				results of t	ile i i	iorida Aiterriate Asses	SITIE	π.	
2012	Current Level of Po	erforn	nance:		2013 Expe	ected	d Level of Performar	nce:		
and 30			ing gains in Math in 201 arning gains in 2011-12.				our students making I at least 36.5%, a 6.5			
		Pr	oblem-Solving Proces	s to	Increase St	uder	nt Achievement			
	Anticipated Bar	rier	Strategy	ı	Person or Position Responsible Monitoring	for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		Evaluation Tool	
	The cognitive functioning levels for all of the students and the physical disabilities for approximately one-half of the student population impact the performance on the Florida Alternate Assessment.  Teachers will use the UniqueLearningSystem instructional tool and include the appropriate grade level(s) Math Access Points in their weekly lesson plans.			rincipal		Classroom Walkthrou and periodic review of student performance the Math Access Poi	of e on	Florida Alternate Assessment		
	on the analysis of sprovement for the fol		t achievement data, and group:	l refe	erence to "Gu	ıiding	Questions", identify	and o	define areas in nee	
l .	AT 2.0: Percentage		udents in Lowest 25% hematics.							
Mathe	ematics Goal #4:									
2012	Current Level of Po	erforn	nance:		2013 Expe	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
		Pr	oblem-Solving Proces	s to	Increase St	uder	nt Achievement			
Antic	ipated Barrier	Strat	egy	Posi Res for	son or ition ponsible nitoring	Dete Effe	cess Used to ermine ectiveness of utegy	Eval	uation Tool	
			No	Data	Submitted					

			Elementary So	shool Ma	athomat	ics Goal #			
	ojectives (AN	ble Annual MOs). In six year nievement gap	5A :			103 Oddi #			_
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2 2012-2013	2013-201	4	2014	1-2015	2015-2016	5 2	2016-2017
		tudent achievemo	ent data, and r	eferenc	e to "Gu	uiding Ques	stions", identify	and define	areas in nee
Hispanic, Asi	an, America	oy ethnicity (Whan Indian) not mathematics.							
Mathematics	Goal #5B:								
2012 Current	2012 Current Level of Performance:				)13 Exp	ected Leve	el of Performa	nce:	
		Problem-Sol	ving Process	to Incr	ease St	udent Ach	nievement		
Anticipated E	Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posit Resp for				ion onsible Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy				ın Tool
			'	ata Sub					
		tudent achieveme lowing subgroup:	ent data, and r	eferenc	e to "Gu	uiding Ques	stions", identify	and define	areas in nee
_		arners (ELL) no mathematics.	t making						
Mathematics	Goal #5C:								
2012 Current	t Level of Pe	erformance:		20	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
		Problem-Sol	ving Process	to Incr	ease St	udent Ach	nievement		
Anticipated E	Barrier	Strategy	P R fc	erson d osition espons or Ionitori	sible	Process l Determin Effective Strategy	ie	Evaluatio	n Tool
			No D	ata Sub	mitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:

satisf	actory progress ir	n math	nematics.								
Mathe	ematics Goal #5D:										
2012	Current Level of P	erforr	nance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:						
		Pr	oblem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease Sti	uder	nt Achievement				
	Anticipated Bar	rier	Strategy	R	Person or Position esponsible Monitoring	for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		Evaluation Tool		
1	Teachers need to become familiar wit Access Courses and Access Points for Mathematics.	h the	Teachers will participat in Professional Learning Communities to study t Access Courses and Access Points for Mathematics.		ncipal		Periodic review of wellesson plans and tead observations		Teacher Evaluatio System and Classroom Walkthroughs		
	on the analysis of sprovement for the fo		t achievement data, and subgroup:	l refer	ence to "Gu	iding	Questions", identify a	and c	define areas in need		
1	conomically Disad		ged students not maki	ng							
	ematics Goal #5E:	mati	iematics.								
2012	Current Level of P				2012 5		I a col of Danfarra				
2012	Current Level of P	errorr	папсе:		2013 EXPE	ectec	d Level of Performan	ce:			
		Pr	oblem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease Sti	uder	nt Achievement				
Antic	ipated Barrier	Strat		for	ion onsible	Dete Effe	ocess Used to cermine ectiveness of ategy		aluation Tool		
					Submitted		1				
							End of Element	ary S	chool Mathematics Goa		
Middl	e School Math	emat	ics Goals								
* Whei	n using percentages, i	nclude	the number of students th	e perc	entage repres	sents	(e.g., 70% (35)).				
	on the analysis of sprovement for the fo		t achievement data, and group:	l refer	ence to "Gu	iding	Questions", identify a	and c	define areas in nee		
l	CAT2.0: Students sematics.	scorin	g at Achievement Leve	el 3 in							
Math	ematics Goal #1a:										
2012	Current Level of P	erforr	nance:		2013 Expe	ectec	Level of Performan	ce:			

	Problem-Solvi	ing Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posi Resp		on or ion onsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool			
		No Data S	Submitted		,			
		it data, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", ider	ntify and define areas in nee			
of improvement for the 1b. Florida Alternate / Students scoring at Le Mathematics Goal #1b	Assessment: evels 4, 5, and 6 in I	mathematics.						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfor	mance:			
	Problem-Solvi	ing Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool			
		No Data S	Submitted		,			
Based on the analysis o of improvement for the		it data, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", ider	ntify and define areas in nee			
2a. FCAT 2.0: Student Level 4 in mathematic Mathematics Goal #28	CS.	ve Achievement						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
	Problem-Solvi	ing Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool			
		No Data S	Submitted					

2b. Florida Alternate As Students scoring at or a mathematics.		vel 7 in					
Mathematics Goal #2b:							
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perforr	mance:		
	Problem-Solving P	rocess to I	ncrease S <sup>-</sup>	tudent Achievement			
Anticipated Barrier	Anticipated Barrier Strategy		on or ion onsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
		No Data	Submitted				
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo		a, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", ident	ify and define areas in nee		
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentag gains in mathematics.	ge of students making I	learning					
Mathematics Goal #3a:							
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Ехр	ected Level of Perform	mance:		
	Problem-Solving P	rocess to I	ncrease S <sup>-</sup>	tudent Achievement			
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or ion onsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
		No Data	Submitted				
Based on the analysis of soft improvement for the fo		a, and refer	rence to "G	uiding Questions", ident	ify and define areas in nee		
3b. Florida Alternate As Percentage of students mathematics.		s in					
Mathematics Goal #3b:							
2012 Current Level of P	erformance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
	Problem-Solving P	rocess to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement			

Anticipated E	3arrier	Strategy		Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process L Determin Effectiver Strategy	е	Evalua	ation Tool
			No	Data S	Submitted				
Based on the a		student achievemo	ent data, and	d refere	ence to "G	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and de	 fine areas in nee
	_	e of students in L n mathematics.	Lowest 25%	)					
Mathematics	Goal #4:								
2012 Current	Level of P	erformance:			2013 Exp	ected Leve	el of Performa	nce:	
		Problem-Sol	ving Proces	ss to Ir	ncrease S	tudent Ach	nievement		
Anticipated E	anticipated Barrier Strategy			Perso Positi Respo for Monit	ion onsible	Process L Determin Effectiver Strategy	е	Evaluation Tool	
			No		Submitted	1			
Based on Amb	itious but A	chievable Annual	Measurable (				Reading and Ma	ath Perf	ormance Target
5A. Ambitious Measurable Ob school will red by 50%.	jectives (Al	able Annual MOs). In six year chievement gap	5A :						2
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-201	2 2012-2013	2013-2	014	201	4-2015	2015-2016	6	2016-2017
		student achieveme llowing subgroup:	ent data, and	d refere	ence to "Gi	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and de	fine areas in nee
Hispanic, Asia	an, Americ	by ethnicity (Whan Indian) not mathematics.							
Mathematics	Goal #5B:								
2012 Current	Level of P	erformance:			2013 Exp	ected Leve	el of Performa	nce:	
		Problem-Sol	ving Proces	ss to Ir	ncrease S	tudent Ach	nievement		

Antic	cipated Barrier	Strat	egy	Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	Dete Effe	termine Eectiveness of rategy		uation Tool	
			No	Data	Submitted	•				
	on the analysis of sprovement for the fo		t achievement data, and g subgroup:	l refer	ence to "Gu	uiding	Questions", identify	and c	define areas in nee	
	nglish Language Le factory progress ir		rs (ELL) not making							
	ematics Goal #5C:	mati	iematics.							
2012	2012 Current Level of Performance:				2013 Expe	ected	Level of Performar	nce:		
		Pr	oblem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease St	uden	t Achievement			
Antic	riticipated Barrier Strategy F		Posit Resp for	tor .		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		valuation Tool		
			No		Submitted					
			t achievement data, and	l refer	rence to "Gu	uiding	Questions", identify	and c	define areas in nee	
-	tudents with Disab		(SWD) not making							
	factory progress ir	n math	nematics.							
Math	ematics Goal #5D:									
2012	Current Level of P	erforn	nance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
		Pr	oblem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease St	uden	t Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier Strategy		R	Person or Position Pesponsible Monitoring	e for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness o Strategy		Evaluation Too		
1	Teachers need to become familiar wit Access Courses and Access Points for Mathematics.		Teachers will participat in Professional Learning Communities to study t Access Courses and Access Points for Mathematics.		ncipal	_	Periodic review of we lesson plans and tea observations	,	Teacher Evaluation System and Classroom Walkthroughs	

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #5E	:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solvii	ng Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or ion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		No Data	Submitted			
				End	of Middle School Mathematics Goa	
Florida Alternate A	ssessment High	School Mat	hematic	es Goals		

\* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis o in need of improvement			eference t	o "Guiding Questions",	identify and define areas
1. Florida Alternate A Levels 4, 5, and 6 in n Mathematics Goal #1:	nathematics.	nts scoring at			
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfo	rmance:
	Problem-Solvin	g Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or ion onsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data S	Submitted		
		<u> </u>	·		

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:						
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2:						
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:					

	Problem-Solving Proces	s to Increase S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No	Data Submitted		

Based on the analysis of in need of improvement	f student achievement data for the following group:	, and r	eference to	"Guiding Questions",	identify and define areas	
3. Florida Alternate As making learning gains	ssessment: Percent of stu in mathematics.	udents				
Mathematics Goal #3:						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving Proce	ss to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No	o Data :	Submitted			

# Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

\* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)). Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy Responsible **Evaluation Tool** Effectiveness of for Strategy Monitoring

No Data Submitted

Based on the a of improvement			ent data, and	d refere	ence to "Gu	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and o	define areas in need		
2. Students s and 5 in Alge	_	or above Achieve	ement Level	s 4							
Algebra Goal	#2:										
2012 Current	Level of P	erformance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:						
		Problem-Sol	ving Proces	stolr	ncrease St	tudent Ach	nievement				
Anticipated Barrier Strategy P			Perso Positi Respo for Monit	on onsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		Eval	uation Tool			
			No	Data S	Submitted						
Based on Amb	itious but A	chievable Annual	Measurable ( Algebra Goa		ves (AMOs	), AMO-2, I	Reading and Ma	ath Pe	erformance Target		
	ojectives (Al	able Annual MOs). In six year chievement gap	3A :	1 //					<u> </u>		
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-201	2 2012-2013	2013-20	014	2014-2015		2015-2016	5	2016-2017		
	-	student achieveme	ent data, and	d refere	ence to "Gu	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and o	define areas in need		
3B. Student s	subgroups an, Americ	by ethnicity (Whan Indian) not m									
Algebra Goal	#3B:										
2012 Current	Level of P	erformance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:						
		Problem-Sol	ving Proces	s to Ir	ncrease St	tudent Ach	ilevement				
Anticipated E	Anticipated Barrier Strategy Po fo		Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		Evaluation Tool				
			No		Submitted	1		1			

of improvement for the f	following subgroup:					
3C. English Language satisfactory progress		making				
Algebra Goal #3C:						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perform	mance:	
	Problem-Solvii	ng Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	on or tion ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		No Data	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the f		t data, and refe	rence to "G	uiding Questions", ident	tify and define areas in nee	
3D. Students with Disa satisfactory progress		naking				
Algebra Goal #3D:						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solvii	ng Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	on or tion ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		No Data	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of improvement for the f		t data, and refe	rence to "G	uiding Questions", ident	tify and define areas in nee	
3E. Economically Disasatisfactory progress	_	not making				
Algebra Goal #3E:						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perform	mance:	
1	Problem-Solvii	ng Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
No Data Submitted						

End of Algebra EOC Goa

# Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

^ when using percentages	s, include the number of stude	nts the	percentage i	represents (e.g., 10% (35)	)).
	of student achievement data t for the following group:	a, and r	reference to	o "Guiding Questions", ic	dentify and define areas
1. Students scoring a Geometry.	t Achievement Level 3 in				
Geometry Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perforn	nance:
	Problem-Solving Proce	ess to l	ncrease S	student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	son or ition ponsible iitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	N	√o Data	Submitted		
	of student achievement data t for the following group:	a, and r	reference to	o "Guiding Questions", ic	dentify and define areas
2. Students scoring a 4 and 5 in Geometry.	t or above Achievement l	Levels			
Geometry Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Proce	∍ss to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	son or ition ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	<u></u>	No Data	Submitted		

Based on Ambition Target	ıs but	Achievable	e Annual Measura	ble Ob	jectives (A	MOs),	AMO-2, Reading a	and Math Performance
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Geometry Goal #	:				<u> </u>	
Baseline data 2011-2012	201	12-2013	2013-2014		2014-20	15	2015-2016	2016-2017
Based on the anal				and r	reference to	o "Guid	ing Questions", ic	lentify and define areas
3B. Student subg Hispanic, Asian, satisfactory prog	Ameri gress	can India	n) not making	ck,				
Geometry Goal #	38:							
2012 Current Lev	vel of	Performa	nce:		2013 Exp	ected	Level of Perforn	nance:
		Problem	n-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	tudent	t Achievement	
Anticipated Barr	ier	Strategy		Posi Resp for	on or tion ponsible itoring	n Determine Eva		Evaluation Tool
			No	Data	Submitted			
Based on the anal in need of improve				and r	eference to	o "Guid	ing Questions", ic	lentify and define areas
3C. English Lang satisfactory prog	_			g				
Geometry Goal #	43C:							
2012 Current Lev	vel of	Performa	nce:		2013 Exp	ected	Level of Perforn	nance:
		Problem	n-Solving Proces	ss to I	ncrease S	tudent	t Achievement	
Anticipated Barr	Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posit Resp for		on or tion oonsible itoring	Deter	iveness of	Evaluation Tool		
			No	Data	Submitted	-		

in need of improvement	for the following su	ubgroup:				
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.  Geometry Goal #3D:						
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solvin	ng Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	son or tion ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
No Data Si						

	f student achievement dat for the following subgroup		eference to	"Guiding Questions",	identify and define areas
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.					
Geometry Goal #3E:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Proc	ess to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsibl for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade	and/or DLC	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school- wide)		Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Math Access Points and Access Courses	K-12 Mathematics	Principal	Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)	30 minutes per week	Classroom Walkthroughs and Lesson Plan Reviews	Principal

#### Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Mate	eriai(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Access Points/Access Courses	Teacher Computers	NA	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Electronic Lesson Plan Template Interactive Whiteboards	Teacher Computers and CPALMS UniqueLearningSystems	NA	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
PLCs meet weekly Lesson Study School Based Workshop	CPALMS Lesson Study Guide and Substitutes Classroom Suite, Intellikeys/Overlay Maker	Title II	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$500.00

End of Mathematics Goals

# Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

\* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.					
Science Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of	f Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfor	mance:
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

Science Goal #1b:			Assesment. For students will p	5 and 6 in Science based on the Florida Alternate Assesment. For the 2012-13 school year, 17% of our students will perform at Levels 4,5 and 6 as measured by the Florida Alternate Assessment.		
2012	2 Current Level of Perfo	ormance:	2013 Expecte	ed Level of Performand	ce:	
	(2 students) performed nce based on the Florida			17% of our students will perform at Levels 4, 5 and 6 in Science based on the Florida Alternate Assessment.		
	Prob	lem-Solving Process t	o Increase Stude	ent Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1	for approximately one- half of the student	include the appropriate	Principal	Classroom Walkthroughs and periodic review of student performance on the Science Access Points.	Florida Alternate Assessment	

assed on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define reas in need of improvement for the following group:					
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.					
Science Goal #2a:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfor	mance:
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.				
Science Goal #2b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement							
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool			
No Data Submitted							

# Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

\* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.					
Science Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perform	mance:
	Problem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posi Resp		on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
No Data Submitted					

Based on the analysis areas in need of improv			reference	to "Guiding Question	ns", identify and define
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.					
Science Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level o	f Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Pr	ocess to I	ncrease S	itudent Achievemer	nt
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		Moni	toring	2.093	

# Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

Anticipated Barrier

Strategy

\* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of areas in need of improve			l reference	to "Guiding Question	ns", identify and define
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology.					
Biology Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level o	f Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perf	ormance:
	Problem-Solving I	Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievemer	nt
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	son or tion ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		
Based on the analysis of areas in need of improve			l reference	to "Guiding Question	ns", identify and define
2. Students scoring a Levels 4 and 5 in Biol Biology Goal #2:		ement			
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievemer	nt

No Data Submitted

Person or

Responsible

Monitoring

Position

Process Used to

Effectiveness of Strategy **Evaluation Tool** 

Determine

# (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school- wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
	K-12 Science	Principal	Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)	30 minutes per week	Classroom Walktroughs and Lesson Plan Review	Principal

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Progra	arri(s)/Materiar(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developm	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Science Goals

# Writing Goals

' When usi	ing percenta	ages, include	the number	of students	the percent	age represents	s (e.g.,	70% (3	35)).
------------	--------------	---------------	------------	-------------	-------------	----------------	----------	--------	-------

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and r in need of improvement for the following group:	reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas				
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.  Writing Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Responsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool			
No Data Submitted							

	on the analysis of stude ed of improvement for the		nd re	eference to "Gu	iding Questions", identify	y and define areas
at 4 or higher in writing.  Writing Goal #1b:			l t	In 2011-12 14% of our students performed at Level 4 or higher in Writing on the Florida Alternate Assessment. For the 2012-13 school year, 17% of our students will perform at Level 4 or higher in Writing as measured by the Florida Alternate Assessment.		
2012	Current Level of Perfo	rmance:	2	2013 Expecte	d Level of Performance	<b>:</b> :
14% (2 students) performed at Levels 4 or higher in Writing based on the Florida Alternate Assessment.				17% will perform at Levels 4 or higher in Writing based on the Florida Alternate Assessment.		
	Prob	olem-Solving Process t	to In	ncrease Stude	nt Achievement	
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Res	Person or Position sponsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
The cognitive functioning levels for all of the students and the physical disabilities for approximately one-half of the student population impact the performance on the Florida Alternate Assessment.  Teachers will use the UniqueLearningSystems instructional tool and include the appropriate grade level(s) Writing Access Points in their weekly lesson plans.			Prin	ıcipal	Classroom Walkthroughs and periodic review of student performance on the Writing Access Points.	Assessment

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school- wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing Access Points and Access Courses	K-12 Writing	Principal	Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)	30 minutes per	Classroom Walkthroughs and Lesson Plan Reviews	Principal

### Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)							
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount				
Access Points/Access Courses	Teacher Computers	NA	\$0.00				
			Subtotal: \$0.00				

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Electronic Lesson Plan Template Interactive Whiteboards	Teacher Computers and CPALMS UniqueLearningSystems	NA	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
PLCs meet weekly Lesson Study	CPALMS Lesson Study Guide and Substitutes	NA	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Writing Goals

## Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

\* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of in need of improvement			reference to	"Guiding Questions"	, identify and define areas
1. Students scoring at	Achievement Le	evel 3 in Civic	5.		
Civics Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Exp	2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solvi	ng Process to	Increase S	tudent Achievemen	t
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Pos Res for	rson or sition sponsible nitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	3 Submitted		

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and r in need of improvement for the following group:	reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas
<ul><li>2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels</li><li>4 and 5 in Civics.</li><li>Civics Goal #2:</li></ul>	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Problem-Solving Process to I	ncrease Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No	Data Submitted		

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

#### Civics Budget:

Evidence-based Progr	am(s)/Material(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		-	Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developn	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Civics Goals

# U.S. History End-of-Cource (EOC) Goals

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

<sup>\*</sup> When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Students scoring a     History.	t Achievement Lev	vel 3 in U.S.			
U.S. History Goal #1:					
2012 Current Level o	f Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfo	ormance:
	Problem-Solvin	g Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achievemen	t
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	on or tion oonsible Itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		·
					identify and define areas

	used on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas need of improvement for the following group:				
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels     and 5 in U.S. History.					
U.S. History Goal #2:					
2012 Current Level of	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perforr	mance:
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Position		on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No	Data	Submitted		

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	
	No Data Submitted						

### U.S. History Budget:

Evidence-based Progra	am(s)/Material(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developm	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of U.S. History EOC Goals

# Attendance Goal(s)

\* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee of improvement:			
1. Attendance			
Attendance Goal #1:			
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:		
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		
Problem-Solving Process to	Increase Student Achievement		

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
No Data Submitted					

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
		Ν	lo Data Submitted	d		

#### Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Progra	am(s)/Material(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developm	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

## Suspension Goal(s)

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:

<sup>\*</sup> When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Suspension Goal #1:						
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions			2013 Expected	d Number of In-Schoo	l Suspensions	
2012	Total Number of Stude	nts Suspended In-Scho	ol 2013 Expecte School	d Number of Students	Suspended In-	
2012	Number of Out-of-Scho	ool Suspensions	2013 Expecte Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		
2012 School	Total Number of Stude ol	nts Suspended Out-of-	2013 Expecte of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School		
	Prob	olem-Solving Process to	Increase Stude	nt Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1						

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
		Γ	No Data Submitted	d		

### Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)					
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount		
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00		
			Subtotal: \$0.00		

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developm	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

## Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Note: Required for High School - F.S., Sec. 1003.53

Based on the analysis of in need of improvement:	f parent involvement data,	and ref	ference to	"Guiding Questions", id	entify and define areas
1. Dropout Prevention					
Dropout Prevention Go	oal #1:				
*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.					
2012 Current Dropout	Rate:		2013 Exp	ected Dropout Rate:	
2012 Current Graduati	ion Rate:		2013 Expected Graduation Rate:		
	Problem-Solving Proce	ess to L	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

 $<sup>^{\</sup>star}$  When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

#### (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
		Ν	lo Data Submitted	d		

**Dropout Prevention Budget:** 

Evidence-based Progr	am(s)/Material(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developm	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
<u> </u>			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

## Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: 1. Parent Involvement In 2011-12 17 families (17%) attended Prom, 14 families Parent Involvement Goal #1: (14%) attended Open House and 49 families (49%) attended Winter Program. For the 2012-13 school year, \*Please refer to the percentage of parents who 19% of the families will attend the Prom, 16% will attend the school's Open House and 51% of the families will participated in school activities, duplicated or attend the Winter Program. unduplicated. 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: 17 families (17%) attended Prom, 14 families (14%) Parental Involvement at these 3 school events will attended the school's Open House and 49 families (49%) increase by at least 2%. attended the Winter Program. Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

<sup>\*</sup> When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	entire county, some of the families live far from the school.	of the school events to the families through	·	Parent feedback on the communication processes used to inform families of the school events.	Parent Survey

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	: Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
		N	lo Data Submitted	d		

#### Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Progra	am(s)/Material(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developm	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

# Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:						
1. STEM						
STEM Goal #1:						
	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
No Data Submitted						

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	
No Data Submitted							

### STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Progra	am(s)/Material(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developm	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		-	Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

# Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

\* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:						
1. CTE						
CTE Goal #1:						
	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
No Data Submitted						

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	
No Data Submitted							

#### CTE Budget:

Evidence-based Progra	am(s)/Material(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developm	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00

Subtotal: \$0.00

Grand Total: \$0.00

End of CTE Goal(s)

## Additional Goal(s)

In 2011-12 there were 0 incidents of bullying reported at the school. For the 2012-13 school year, there will continue to be 0 incidents of bullying reported at the school. Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas						
	ed of improvement for the					,
1. In 2011-12 there were 0 incidents of bullying reported at the school. For the 2012-13 school year, there will continue to be 0 incidents of bullying reported at the school. Goal  In 2011-12 there were 0 incidents of bullying reported at the school. For the 2012-13 school year, there will continue to be 0 incidents of bullying reported at the school. Goal #1:			1	the school. For	ere were 0 incidents of bu the 2012-13 school yea 0 incidents of bullying re	r, there will
2012 Current level:			:	2013 Expected level:		
In 2011-12 there were no incidents of bullying reported at the school.				There will continue to be 0 incidents of bullying reported at the school.		
	Prol	olem-Solving Process t	toIr	ncrease Stude	ent Achievement	
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Re	Person or Position sponsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Due to the intellectual functioning levels of our students, they have difficulty expressing feelings and desires. This can result in aggressive behaviors to self or others.	and receive training in appropriate restraining techniques (TEACH). There is a team of	Prin	ncipal	Monitor Code Orange emergencies for the school year. Calculate the IEP goal mastery % for goals that address individual student behaviors/social skills.	Code Orange data and IEP goal mastery %.

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	(e.g., PLC,	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)		Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Bullying Training	All Grades	Principal		Complete by end of October	Monitor training completion	Principal

Evidence-based Progra	am(s)/Material(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developm	ent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
	<u> </u>		Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of In 2011-12 there were 0 incidents of bullying reported at the school. For the 2012-13 school year, there will continue to be 0 incidents of bullying reported at the school. Goal(s)

In 2011-12, 82 out of 96 (85.4%) IEP Reading goals were mastered. For the 2012-13 school year, 87% of the IEP Reading goals will be mastered. Goal:

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	
No Data Submitted							

#### Budget:

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		•	Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of In 2011-12, 82 out of 96 (85.4%) IEP Reading goals were mastered. For the 2012-13 school year, 87% of the IEP Reading goals will be mastered. Goal(s)

## FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Pro	ogram(s)/Material(s)	Description		
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amoun
Reading	Access Points/Access Courses	Teacher Computers and Computer Based Instructional Tools/Resources	NA	\$0.00
Mathematics	Access Points/Access Courses	Teacher Computers	NA	\$0.00
Writing	Access Points/Access Courses	Teacher Computers	NA	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.0
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amoun
Reading	Electronic Lesson Plan Template Interactive Whiteboards	Teacher Computers and CPALMS UniqueLearningSystems	NA	\$0.00
Mathematics	Electronic Lesson Plan Template Interactive Whiteboards	Teacher Computers and CPALMS UniqueLearningSystems	NA	\$0.00
Writing	Electronic Lesson Plan Template Interactive Whiteboards	Teacher Computers and CPALMS UniqueLearningSystems	NA	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.0
Professional Devel	opment			
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amoun
Reading	PLCs meet weekly Lesson Study School Based Workshop	CPALMS Lesson Study and substitutes Classroom Suite, Intellikeys/Overlay Maker	Title II	\$500.00
Mathematics	PLCs meet weekly Lesson Study School Based Workshop	CPALMS Lesson Study Guide and Substitutes Classroom Suite, Intellikeys/Overlay Maker	Title II	\$500.00
Writing	PLCs meet weekly Lesson Study	CPALMS Lesson Study Guide and Substitutes	NA	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$1,000.0
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amoun
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.0
				Subtotal: \$0.0
				Grand Total: \$1,000.0

## Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

		jn Priority	jn Focus	j∩ Prevent	<b>j</b> n NA	
--	--	-------------	----------	------------	---------------	--

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

A reward school is any school that improves their letter grade or any school graded A.

No Attachment (Uploaded on 9/10/2012)

### School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting "Yes" or "No" below.

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

Describe the activities of the School Advisory Council for the upcoming year

The School Improvement Plan is sceduled for approval by the SAC on September 11, 2012. The purpose of the School Advisory Council is to perform the functions that are prescribed by the regulations of the School Board. The SAC will assist in the preparation and evaluation of the School Improvement Plan, will provide advice concerning the annual school budget and will approve the use of the school improvement funds.

# AYP DATA

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2011-2012 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2010-2011 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2009-2010

## SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found No Data Found No Data Found